

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEAUFORT DIVISION

KIMBERLY J. HARRIS,	
Plaintiff, §	
<u> </u>	}
vs. §	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:09-0028-HFF-BM
§	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL §	
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, §	
Defendant.	3

ORDER

This case was filed as a Social Security action. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the decision of Defendant be reversed and this case be remanded to Defendant for the purpose of a proper evaluation, discussion and findings with respect to the medical records relating to Plaintiff's diabetes and peripheral neuropathy, and for such further administrative action as is deemed necessary and appropriate. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or

recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on December 2, 2009. On December 21, 2009,

Defendant informed the Court that he would not be filing any objections to the Report. In the

absence of such objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a failure to object

waives appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set

forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment

of the Court that the decision of Defendant be REVERSED and this case be REMANDED to

Defendant for the purpose of a proper evaluation, discussion and findings with respect to the medical

records relating to Plaintiff's diabetes and peripheral neuropathy, and for such further administrative

action as is deemed necessary and appropriate.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 28th day of December, 2009, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd

ENRY F. FLOYD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE